

Evaluating the Performance of A Sponge-based Moving Bed Bioreactor on Micropollutants Removal

by

Qi Jiang

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Engineering

University of Technology, Sydney
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

May, 2016

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Name: Qi Jiang

Date: 23/05/2016

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and support of the outstanding individuals I met in the course of my research study. Now it is my turn to acknowledge them all.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisors Dr. Wenshan Guo and Prof. Huu Hao Ngo. The doors to my supervisors' office were always open whenever I ran into trouble or had questions regarding my research or writing. Their guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I could not have imagined having better advisors and mentors for my research study.

I would like to extend my particular gratitude to Prof. Long Nghiem from the University of Wollongong for his help and valued feedbacks about my experiments and academic writing. Dr. Jinguo Kang is indebted for his help in the GC-MS analysis of micropollutants. Kaushalya Wijekoon and Luong Nguyen are thanked for their assistance with the freeze drying of sludge samples.

My sincere thanks also goes to Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology for providing a fabulous academic atmosphere for doing research. I am particularly thankful to lab manager Mohammed Johir for his kind and generous help throughout my experiments. My appreciation also goes to my other dear colleagues, Yunlong Luo, Lijuan Deng, Thi Phuong Tram Vo, Thi An Hang Nguyen, Van-son Tran and Cheng Chen, for their generous help in various aspects of this research.

Last but not least, I would also like to give my deepest thanks to my parents and my partner for their faith their encouragement in all of my pursuits, as well as for supporting me throughout my life.

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Certificate of Original Authorship	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	xi
List of Abbreviations	xvi
List of Symbols	xvii
Abstract	xix
 Chapter 1 Introduction	 1-1
1.1 Background	1-2
1.2 Impact of micropollutants and reduction strategies	1-3
1.3 Objectives of the research	1-6
1.4 Outline of the thesis	1-6
 Chapter 2 Literature Review	 2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-2
2.2 Micropollutants contamination	2-4
2.2.1 Adverse effects of micropollutants	2-4
2.2.2 Occurrence of micropollutants in aquatic environment	2-7
2.2.3 Removal of micropollutants in wastewater treatment	2-12
2.3 Background of the attached growth systems	2-19
2.3.1 Attached growth systems	2-19
2.3.2 Media used in attached growth systems	2-26
2.4 Moving bed biofilm reactors (MBBRs)	2-31

2.4.1 Media material	2-32
2.4.2 Media geometry and size	2-34
2.4.3 Media filling ratio	2-35
2.4.4 Other impact factors	2-36
2.4.5 Micropollutant removal in MBBR process	2-36
2.5 Attached growth based membrane hybrid system	2-37
2.5.1 Membrane fouling	2-38
2.5.2 Enhanced hybrid membrane system with attached growth media	2-39
2.5.3 Micropollutant removal in attached growth based hybrid membrane system	2-42
2.6 Conclusion	2-43

Chapter 3 Experimental Investigation **3-1**

3.1 Introduction	3-2
3.2 Materials	3-2
3.2.1 Synthetic wastewater	3-2
3.2.2 Selected micropollutants	3-2
3.2.3 Sponge (polyurethane foam)	3-3
3.3 Experimental set-up and operation protocol	3-9
3.3.1 MBBR system	3-9
3.3.2 MBBR-MBR system	3-10
3.3.3 SSMBR system	3-11
3.3.4 Operation protocol	3-12
3.4 Analytical methods	3-15
3.4.1 Organic matter, nutrients, pH and DO	3-15
3.4.2 MLSS and MLVSS	3-16
3.4.3 Micropollutant	3-17
3.4.4 Fouling resistance	3-17

Chapter 4 Micropollutant Removal in an Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor (MBBR) at Different HRTs **4-1**

4.1 Introduction	4-2
4.2 Organic and nutrient removal	4-2
4.3 Removals of selected micropollutants	4-16
4.4 Comparison between the MBBR and other techniques for micropollutant removal	4-28
4.5 Conclusions	4-30

Chapter 5 Removal of Micropollutants by an Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor-Membrane Bioreactor (MBBR-MBR) Hybrid System at Different HRTs

5-1

5.1 Introduction	5-2
5.2 Organic matter and nutrient removal	5-5
5.3 Removals of selected micropollutants	5-19
5.4 Membrane fouling analysis	5-32
5.5 Conclusions	5-37

Chapter 6 Evaluation of Micropollutant removal and fouling reduction in a Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor-Membrane Bioreactor Hybrid System

6-1

6.1 Introduction	6-2
6.2 Organic and nutrient removal	6-3
6.3 Removals of selected micropollutants	6-8
6.4 Membrane fouling analysis	6-10
6.5 Conclusions	6-15

Chapter 7 Conclusions and Recommendations

7-1

7.1 Conclusions	7-2
7.2 Recommendations for future research	7-4

References

R-1

Publications Related to This Research

P-1

List of Figures

- Figure 1.1 Schematic presentation of diffuse and point source entry paths of micropollutants in the environment
- Figure 1.2 The outline of the thesis
- Figure 2.1 Contamination pathways for micropollutants into the aquatic environment (Stuart et al., 2012)
- Figure 2.2 Main removal mechanisms of micropollutants in conventional WWTPs
- Figure 3.1 The attached-growth carriers (sponge cubes) used in this study
- Figure 3.2 On-site photo and schematic diagram of the MBBR
- Figure 3.3 On-site photo and schematic diagram of the MBBR-MBR system
- Figure 3.4 On-site photo of the SSMBR system
- Figure 3.5 Schematic diagram of SPE process for GC-MS analysis of micropollutants
- Figure 3.6 Schematic diagram of solvent extraction process of sludge samples
- Figure 3.7 The analytical instruments used in this study
- Figure 3.8 Procedure used for SPE of analysing micropollutants
- Figure 3.9 Schematic diagram of processes for SMP and EPS extraction
- Figure 3.10 Relative hydrophobicity test (A) and microscopic analysis (B)
- Figure 4.1 TOC removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 24 h)
- Figure 4.2 COD removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 24 h)
- Figure 4.3 $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$ removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 24 h)
- Figure 4.4 TN removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 24 h)
- Figure 4.5 $\text{PO}_4\text{-P}$ removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 24 h)
- Figure 4.6 Summarized removal efficiencies in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 24 h)
- Figure 4.7 TOC removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 18 h)

- Figure 4.8 COD removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 18 h)
- Figure 4.9 NH₄-N removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 18 h)
- Figure 4.10 TN removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 18 h)
- Figure 4.11 PO₄-P removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 18 h)
- Figure 4.12 Summarized removal efficiencies in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 24 h)
- Figure 4.13 TOC removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 12 h)
- Figure 4.14 COD removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 12 h)
- Figure 4.15 NH₄-N removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 12 h)
- Figure 4.16 TN removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 12 h)
- Figure 4.17 PO₄-P removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 12 h)
- Figure 4.18 Summarized removal efficiencies in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 12 h)
- Figure 4.19 TOC removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 6 h)
- Figure 4.20 COD removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 6 h)
- Figure 4.21 NH₄-N removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 6 h)
- Figure 4.22 TN removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 6 h)
- Figure 4.23 PO₄-P removal in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 6 h)

- Figure 4.24 Summarized removal efficiencies in the MBBR (aeration rate: 4 L/min; DO: 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT: 6 h)
- Figure 4.25 Micropollutant removals in the MBBR unit at HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h. The error bar of each sample represents the standard deviation over the experiment period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6 h)
- Figure 4.26 Relationship of Log D and pharmaceutical compounds removals in the MBBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L, HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h)
- Figure 4.27 Relationship of Log D and pesticides removals in the MBBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h)
- Figure 4.28 Relationship of Log D and industrial chemicals removals in the MBBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h)
- Figure 4.29 Relationship of Log D and estrogenic hormones removals in the MBBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h)
- Figure 4.30 Fate of the studied micropollutants in the MBBR system (aeration rate: 4L/min; HRT: 24 h)
- Figure 4.31 Fate of the studied micropollutants in the MBBR system (aeration rate: 4L/min; HRT: 18 h)
- Figure 4.32 Fate of the studied micropollutants in the MBBR system (aeration rate: 4L/min; HRT: 12 h)
- Figure 4.33 Fate of the studied micropollutants in the MBBR system (aeration rate: 4L/min; HRT: 6 h)
- Figure 5.1 TOC removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=24 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT =

- 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.2 COD removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=24 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.3 NH₄-N removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=24 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.4 TN removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=24 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.5 PO₄-P removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=24 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.6 Summarized removal efficiencies in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO = 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=24 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.7 TOC removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=18 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.8 COD removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=18 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.9 NH₄-N removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=18 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

- Figure 5.10 TN removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=18 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.11 PO₄-P removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=18 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.12 Summarized removal efficiencies in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO = 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=18 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.13 TOC removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=12 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.14 COD removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=12 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.15 NH₄-N removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=12 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.16 TN removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=12 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.17 PO₄-P removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=12 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.18 Summarized removal efficiencies in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR

conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO = 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=12 h;
 MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L;
 filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.19 TOC removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=6 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.20 COD removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=6 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.21 NH₄-N removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=6 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.22 TN removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=6 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.23 PO₄-P removal in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO: 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=6 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.24 Summarized removal efficiencies in the MBBR-MBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4 L/min; DO = 5.5-6.5 mg/L; HRT=6 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.25 Micropollutant removals in the MBBR-MBR while MBBR unit operating at HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h. The error bar of each sample represents the standard deviation over the experiment period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6 h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h;

SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.26 Relationship of Log D and pharmaceutical removals in the MBBR-MBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L, HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.27 Relationship of Log D and pesticides removals in the MBBR-MBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L, HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.28 Relationship of Log D and industrial chemicals removals in the MBBR-MBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L, HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.29 Relationship of Log D and estrogenic hormones removals in the MBBR-MBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L, HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.30 Fate of the studied micropollutants in the MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L, HRT = 24h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

Figure 5.31 Fate of the studied micropollutants in the MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L, HRT = 18h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

- Figure 5.32 Fate of the studied micropollutants in the MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L, HRT = 12h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.33 Fate of the studied micropollutants in the MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L, HRT = 6h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.34 Comparison of TMP profiles in the MBR while MBBR was operating at HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 5.35 Comparison of EPS and SMP values in the MBR while MBBR was operating at HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h, 18h, 12h and 6h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.1 TOC removal in the MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.2 COD removal in the MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.3 NH₄-N removal in the MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.4 TN removal in the MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83

L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

- Figure 6.5 PO₄-P removal in the MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; MBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.6 TOC removal in the CMBR system (conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.7 COD removal in the CMBR system (conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.8 NH₄-N removal in the CMBR system (conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.9 TN removal in the CMBR system (conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.10 PO₄-P removal in the CMBR system (conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.11 Variations of MLSS and MLVSS concentrations in the CMBR
- Figure 6.12 Nematodes (×10) in the CMBR
- Figure 6.13 Micropollutant removals in the CMBR and MBBR-MBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; CMBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.14 Relationship of Log D and pharmaceutical compounds removals in the CMBR and MBBR-MBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; CMBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)

- Figure 6.15 Relationship of Log D and pesticides removals in the CMBR and MBBR-MBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; CMBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.16 Relationship of Log D and industrial chemicals removals in the CMBR and MBBR-MBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; CMBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.17 Relationship of Log D and estrogenic hormones removals in the CMBR and MBBR-MBR. An error bar represents the standard deviation over the experimental period (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; CMBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.18 Fate of the studied micropollutants in the hybrid MBBR-MBR system (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; CMBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.19 Comparison of TMP profiles between the hybrid MBBR-MBR and the CMBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; CMBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.20 Comparison of EPS and SMP values between the hybrid MBBR-MBR and the CMBR (MBBR conditions: aeration rate = 4.5 L/min, DO = 5.5–6.5 mg/L; HRT = 24h; CMBR conditions: aeration rate = 6 L/min, DO = 6.4–7.6 mg/L; filtration rate = 8.83 L/m²·h; HRT = 6h; SRT = ∞)
- Figure 6.21 Comparison of fouled membrane and after physical and chemical cleaning

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Summary of adverse effects from micropollutants
Table 2.2	Concentration of selected micropollutants in aquatic environment
Table 2.3	Performance of different attached growth systems
Table 2.4	Biomass content on various attached growth media
Table 2.5	Data of 8 different plastic media (Stephenson et al., 2013)
Table 3.1	Composition and concentration of the stock solution
Table 3.2	Physicochemical properties of the selected trace organics
Table 4.1	Results for organic matters and nutrients removal by MBBR at HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h
Table 4.2	Results for both suspended and attached biomass in MBBR at HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h
Table 4.3	Comparison of micropollutant removal efficiency (%) in the MBBR and in other biological treatment technologies
Table 5.1	Results for organic matters and nutrients removal by MBBR-MBR at HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h
Table 5.2	Results for both suspended and attached biomass in MBBR-MBR at HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h
Table 5.3	Membrane resistance for different types of fouling
Table 5.4	Sludge characteristics in MBR unit at HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h
Table 6.1	Membrane resistances for different types of fouling

List of Abbreviations

CAS	Conventional activate sludge
DO	Dissolved oxygen
EPS	Extracellular polymeric substance
GAC	Granule activated carbon
GC-MS	Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry
HRT	Hydraulic retention time
MBBR	Moving bed biofilm reactor
MBR	Membrane bioreactor
MBBR-MBR	Moving bed biofilm reactor-membrane bioreactor
MF	Microfiltration
MLSS	Mixed liquor suspended solids
MLVSS	Mixed liquor volatile suspended solids
OLR	Organic loading rate
PAC	Powdered activated carbon
PCP	Personal care product
PPCP	Pharmaceutical and personal care product
PU	Polyurethane
PVA	Polyvinyl alcohol
PVDF	Polyvinylidene fluoride
SMP	Soluble microbial products
SND	Simultaneous nitrification–denitrification
SPE	Solid phase extraction
SRT	Sludge retention time
TMP	Transmembrane pressure
TN	Total nitrogen
TOC	Total organic carbon
WWTP	Wastewater treatment plant

List of Symbols

$C_{s, a}$	Concentration of micropollutant on the attached biosolids ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
$C_{s, s}$	Concentration of micropollutant on the suspended biosolids ($\mu\text{g/g}$)
$C_{w, \text{eff}}$	Average effluent concentrations of micropollutants (ng/L)
$C_{w, \text{inf}}$	Average influent concentrations of micropollutants (ng/L)
J	Permeation flux ($\text{L/m}^2\cdot\text{h}$)
K_{OW}	Octanol–water partition coefficient
L_s	Load of micropollutant removed via sorption (ng)
L_b	Load of micropollutant removed via biodegradation (ng)
L_{inf}	the influent load of micropollutants over the experimental period (ng)
L_{eff}	the effluent load of micropollutants over the experimental period (ng)
MLSS	Mixed liquor suspended biosolids concentration (g/L)
pK_a	Acid dissociation constant
ΔP_T	Transmembrane pressure (kPa)
Q	Flow rate of the MBBR (L/day)
R_c	Cake resistance formed by cake layer deposited over membrane surface (m^{-1})
R_f	Fouling resistance caused by pore plugging and/or solute adsorption onto the membrane pore and surface (m^{-1})
R_m	Intrinsic membrane resistance caused by membrane itself and permanent resistance (m^{-1})
ΔSS	Increased amount of attached biosolids over the study period (g)
T	Duration of the study period (day)
μ	Viscosity of the permeate (m^2/s)

Abstract

The ubiquitous occurrence of micropollutants and their metabolites in the aquatic environment has posed threats to living organisms to a great extent. However, effective micropollutants removal normally requires longer hydraulic retention time (HRT) when using biological treatment systems. As an ideal and low-cost material for attached-growth microorganisms, polyurethane sponge has exhibited high potential to eliminate micropollutants. In this study, a sponge-based moving bed biofilm reactor (MBBR) was investigated at four different HRTs (24, 18, 12, 6 h), to better understanding of the effect of HRT on micropollutant removal. The MBBR as pretreatment to a membrane bioreactor (MBBR-MBR hybrid system) was also evaluated. Four groups of frequently detected micropollutants in wastewater (total 22 compounds) were selected, namely pharmaceuticals and personal care products (PPCPs), pesticides, hormones and industrial chemicals.

The MBBR alone showed stable and effective removals of TOC (92.6% - 95.8%), COD (93.0% - 96.1%) and $\text{NH}_4\text{-H}$ (73.6%-95.6%) at all HRTs while improving $\text{PO}_4\text{-P}$ removal at HRT of 18 h. The MBBR showed the highest performance efficiency for removing DOC, COD, $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$, $\text{PO}_4\text{-P}$ and TN at HRT of 18 h, which were $96.1\pm0.4\%$, $97.4\pm0.8\%$, $91.1\pm1.6\%$, $49.9\pm7.2\%$, and $72.3\pm6.9\%$, respectively. This could be explained by the food to microorganisms (F/M) ratio in the MBBR. In addition, higher $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$ removal at HRT of 18 h could be attributed to the increased population of ammonium oxidation bacteria in the MBBR unit. Moreover, the use of phosphate for biomass growth and the phosphorus uptake by phosphate accumulating organisms (PAOs) could contribute to the high removal of $\text{PO}_4\text{-P}$ at HRT of 18 h. In terms of micropollutants removal, MBBR achieved comparable removal compared to other biological treatment such as activated sludge processes and membrane bioreactor. Although the micropollutants were subjected to biodegradation and sorption, the results indicated compound-specific variation in removal at all HRTs, ranging from 10.7% (carbamazepine) to 98.4% (ibuprofen). Among the selected micropollutants, most of them were biodegradable excluding carbamazepine, fenoprop and metronidazole. In addition, the micropollutants removal could remain constantly high even at lower HRTs with more consistent removal efficiency over the

experimental period (except for carbamazepine, fenoprop, 17 α -ethinylestradiol and 4-tert-octylphenol). Particularly, at HRT of 18 h, the removal of diclofenac was significantly improved by more than 30% and the removals of ketoprofen, gemfibrozil, acetaminophen, bisphenol A, and pentachlorophenol were also better. Overall, HRT of 18 h was the optimum HRT for biological degradation of the micropollutants in the MBBR.

When using an MBBR as pretreatment to an MBR, the MBBR-MBR hybrid system achieved better removal efficiencies for selected micropollutants, such as metronidazole and carbamazepine. Both metronidazole and carbamazepine are nitrogen bearing compounds, where nitrogen is bound to the cyclic structure. The infinite SRT applied in this study could have facilitated the enhanced removal of the nitrogenous compounds. Even MBR can prevent the washout of slow-growing microorganisms like nitrifiers, the impact of MBR removal was minimal at all HRTs. This may probably due to the low MLSS concentration and the large pore size (0.2 μm ; two orders of magnitude larger than the molecular sizes of micropollutants) of the MF membrane used in this study. In addition, a longer HRT (e.g. HRT of 24 h or 18 h) can significantly mitigate membrane fouling when compared with a relatively short HRT (e.g. HRT of 6 h). Especially, the TMP value maintained less than 15 kPa for 60 days (HRT of 18 h) and 68 days (HRT of 24 h). The level of EPS were similar at the beginning of all HRTs, then gradually increased to 15.24 mg/L, 16.43 mg/L, 19.88 mg/L and 22.93 mg/L at the end of operation for MBBR unit under HRT of 24 h, 18 h, 12 h, and 6 h, respectively. The SMP concentration varied for different HRTs but showed minor variation under the same HRT. The SMP concentration was lower at HRT of 24 h, while a significantly higher SMP concentration was observed at HRT of 6 h. As a whole, the MBBR-MBR hybrid system showed improvement in both micropollutants elimination and mitigation in membrane fouling.